

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-30, and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,278 to Hitchcock et al. (hereinafter "Hitchcock"). Claims 6, 11, 13, and 28 have been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejections of claims 6, 11, 13, and 28 moot. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 are not anticipated by Hitchcock.

Hitchcock is directed to a method and apparatus for processing customizable application forms that share information from an extensible database (see, col. 1, lines 11-13). As discussed in the Abstract of Hitchcock, a forms engine allows data sharing between customizable on-line forms, such as college admissions applications. After an applicant completes an application, the data is saved in a database and automatically populates fields in subsequent application forms. Each form is branded for its institution and forms for different institutions differ in appearance and content so that the presence of the third party servicer is transparent to the applicant. The system is extensible without programming, allowing new applicant attributes to be readily incorporated into the system and allowing the content and appearance of the application to be readily changed by changing the description file. Information stored about each attribute allows the

specification of data validation rules and data sharing and grouping rules, as well as dependency rules that permit application page content to depend on applicant's responses on a previous page.

With respect to amended claim 1, amended claim 1 recites:

A method implemented in a computer, the method comprising:

receiving an indication of a desired form to be used for data input;

automatically identifying one or more data input fields to be included on the form, the automatically identifying including:

identifying one or more interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form, and wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request; and

identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere; and

generating, after automatically identifying the one or more data input fields, a form definition including the automatically identified one or more data input fields.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed in Hitchcock.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the elements of claim 6. In the April 18, 2006 Office Action at p. 5, it was asserted that:

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data – *identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere* (col. 11, lines 45-col. 12, line 29, col. 14, lines 49- col. 15, line 27).

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the cited portion of Hitchcock does not disclose the automatically identifying of amended claim 1. The cited

portion of Hitchcock discusses validation of data input by the user. For example, validation that the applicant's name is present, that SAT scores are between 200 and 800, and that once the non-digit characters are stripped out of social security numbers a sequence of nine digits not beginning with "9" or "000" remains (see, col. 14, line 66 – col. 15, line 3).

In contrast, amended claim 1 is directed to automatically identifying one or more data input fields to be included on the form. The cited portion of Hitchcock discusses validating data input by the user into fields of a form, not identifying which data input fields to include on the form. Thus, the cited portion of Hitchcock is directed to validating data input into the fields after the fields to include on the form have been identified, not identifying the fields themselves. Applicant respectfully submits that Hitchcock does not include any discussion or mention of automatically identifying one or more data input fields to be included on a form, including identifying one or more interactions associated with a business logic and identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere as recited in amended claim 1. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Hitchcock cannot disclose the automatically identifying of amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over Hitchcock.

With respect to claims 2-5 and 7-9, given that claims 2-5 and 7-9 depend from amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5 and 7-9 are

likewise allowable over Hitchcock for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

With respect to amended claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that, similar to the discussion above regarding amended claim 1, Hitchcock does not disclose communicating with a business logic to identify the one or more restrictions, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form, the communicating including identifying one or more interactions associated with the business logic, wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request, and identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere as recited in amended claim 10. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 10 is allowable over Hitchcock.

With respect to claims 12 and 14-19, given that claims 12 and 14-19 depend from amended claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12 and 14-19 are likewise allowable over Hitchcock for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 10.

With respect to amended claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that, similar to the discussion above regarding amended claim 1, Hitchcock does not disclose determining one or more attributes that are used by a business logic but not obtained by the business logic elsewhere, wherein the determining is based at least in part on one or more interactions associated with the business logic, each of the one or more interactions being associated with a request to be processed by the business logic and including one or more command definitions to process the

request as recited in amended claim 20. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 20 is allowable over Hitchcock.

With respect to claims 21-25, given that claims 21-25 depend from amended claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21-25 are likewise allowable over Hitchcock for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 20.

With respect to amended claim 26, Applicant respectfully submits that, similar to the discussion above regarding amended claim 1, Hitchcock does not disclose automatically identifying the one or more restrictions by identifying one or more interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form; and identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere as recited in amended claim 26. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 26 is allowable over Hitchcock.

With respect to claims 27 and 29-30, given that claims 27 and 29-30 depend from amended claim 26, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 27 and 29-30 are likewise allowable over Hitchcock for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 26.

With respect to claim 34, claim 34 recites:

An architecture comprising:

a business logic layer to process requests received from a client; and

an execution environment layer via which a form processing module can communicate with the business logic layer, wherein the form processing module obtains, from the business logic layer, an indication of one or more restrictions on data input to a form for a

request to be subsequently processed by the business logic layer, and adds the one or more restrictions to a form definition for the form.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such architecture is disclosed in Hitchcock.

In claim 34, the business logic layer that will subsequently process the data input to the form is the same business logic layer from which the execution environment layer obtains the one or more restrictions. Hitchcock discusses a forms engine that parses the Application Data File to build the HTML form (see, col. 10, lines 40-44). The Application Data File is a specially formatted text file that acts as an application description (see, col. 10, lines 41-42). However, there is no discussion or mention of the forms engine of Hitchcock obtaining one or more restrictions from the same business logic layer that will subsequently process the data. Applicant respectfully submits that a text file that acts as an application description does not process data. Thus, the Application Data File cannot be the business logic layer of claim 34.

Although Hitchcock discuss data validation at col. 14, line 49 – col. 15, line 27, there is no discussion or mention in this cited portion of Hitchcock of where any restrictions for performing this data validation are obtained, much less any discussion or mention of any such restrictions being obtained from a same business logic layer that will subsequently process the data. As there is no discussion or mention in Hitchcock of a business logic layer and an execution environment layer as recited in claim 34, Applicant respectfully submits that Hitchcock cannot disclose the architecture of claim 34. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 34 is allowable over Hitchcock.

With respect to claim 35, given that claim 35 depends from claim 34, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is likewise allowable over Hitchcock for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 34

With respect to amended claim 36, Applicant respectfully submits that, similar to the discussion above regarding amended claim 1, Hitchcock does not disclose accessing a business logic to identify one or more interactions associated with the business logic, wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions for the business logic to process the request, identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere, and indicating that the one or more identified attributes are to be obtained via a data input field on a form, and further indicating that an input for the data input field is needed when submitting the form as recited in amended claim 36. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 36 is allowable over Hitchcock.

With respect to claim 37, given that claim 37 depends from amended claim 36, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 is likewise allowable over Hitchcock for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 36.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 18, 2006

By: Allan T. Sponseller Reg. No. 38,318/
Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256